# westerly

Volume 57:1 | July 2012
ISBN 978-0-9873180-0-8

**Notice of Intention**

*Westerly* will convert the full backfile of *Westerly* (1956–) to electronic text, which will be made available to readers and researchers in 2012. This work is being supported by a grant from the Cultural Fund of the Copyright Agency Limited.

All creative works, articles and reviews converted to electronic format will be correctly attributed and will appear as published. Copyright will remain with the authors, and the material cannot be further republished without authorial permission. *Westerly* will honour any requests to withdraw material from electronic publication. If any author does not wish their work to appear in this format, please contact *Westerly* immediately and your material will be withdrawn.

Contact:
westerly@uwa.edu.au

Publisher
Westerly Centre, The University of Western Australia, Australia



Production
Design: Robyn Mundy Design
Typesetting: Lasertype
Printer: Picton Press, West Perth, WA
Cover artwork: Perdita Phillips, 'Athabasca Glacier' (2007), digital photograph (29.7 × 19.8 cm). Photograph © Perdita Phillips
www.perditaphillips.com
Reproduced with kind permission of the artist.



*Westerly* is published biannually with assistance from the State Government of WA by an investment in this project through the Department of Culture and the Arts. The opinions expressed in *Westerly* are those of individual contributors and not of the Editors or Editorial Advisors.

lotterywest supported

Australian Government | Australia Council for the Arts

This project has also been assisted by the Australian Government through the Australia Council for the Arts, its arts funding and advisory body.

Government of Western Australia

Department of **Culture and the Arts**

# The Virtue of Self-Discipline: Reading Tsiolkas and Foucault*

**Peter Mathews**
Hanyang University

*The Slap* (2008), the fourth novel by Greek-Australian writer Christos Tsiolkas, has proven a sensation in Australian literary circles since its publication. The book has won prizes and critical acclaim, and was recently adapted as an eight-part television miniseries. Tsiolkas structures his novel around the consequences that follow from an incident at a household barbecue, in which an unruly young boy is slapped by a man who is not his father. Each chapter focuses on a different character, with the central figures of Hector and Aisha surrounded by a diverse cast of characters that allows Tsiolkas to portray a wide cross-section of contemporary Australian society. The picture that emerges is hardly complimentary, with racism, religious prejudice, homophobia, and misogyny all rearing their ugly heads across the pages of the novel. While the consensus is that *The Slap* has captured the zeitgeist through its searching evaluation of 'the soul of multicultural Australia in the 21st century'—the words of Neil Mukherjee, whose review in *The Telegraph* epitomises the observations made by many other reviewers and critics—there is

* This work was supported by the research fund of Hanyang University (HY-2010-N).

also a more subtle critique at work in this novel, one that centres on the broader ethical question of discipline and its ambiguous place in the modern world (Mukherjee).

Although this idea presents itself most conspicuously in the form of Hugo, the spoilt, undisciplined child who is slapped at the barbecue, Tsiolkas is equally interested in forms of discipline directed at one's own self. In the early pages of the novel, for instance, Tsiolkas describes the various forms of self-discipline to which Hector submits himself. When Aisha is around he 'had learned to rein his body in, to allow himself to only let go in solitude' (Tsiolkas 1). Tsiolkas describes in detail Hector's morning routine of exercises, a ritual he undertakes with relentless devotion:

> The routine was a series of exercises that he executed without fail every morning. At most, it never lasted more than twenty minutes. Occasionally, if he woke with a headache or hangover, or with a combination of both, or simply with an ennui that seemed to issue from deep within what he could only assume to be his soul, he managed to complete it all in under ten minutes. It was not strict adherence to the routine that mattered but simply ensuring its completion—even when he was sick, he would force himself to do it. (1–2)

This display of self-discipline, the narrator reveals, stems from Hector's sense of sexual self-esteem, his handsome features drawing attention from women of varying ages and attractiveness. Hector is embarrassed that his son Adam, who is obsessed with video games and other sedentary forms of entertainment, fails to emulate his physical achievements. 'He couldn't help but see his son's corpulence as a slight,' writes Tsiolkas, a strain that expresses itself as an unspoken mixture of hurt and aggression (6).

This pattern repeats itself, in turn, in the tension between Hector and Aisha over his smoking habit. Hector's daily exercise routine pales next to his wife's ability to balance her high-pressure job as a

successful veterinarian with her home life as a wife and mother, all while maintaining her own striking physical beauty. When Hector emerges from his routine looking, in the words of Aisha, 'like a bum,' Tsiolkas informs the reader that she, by contrast, 'would never leave the house without make-up or proper clothes on' (3). Just as Hector looks down on his son for failing to live up to his own standards of physical self-discipline, so too Aisha chastises Hector for his lapses. When Hector fails to quit smoking, falling back into the arms of his 'malignant lover' (4), it leads to a bitter row that again hinges on the issue of self-discipline: 'The fight was cruel and exhausting[.] […] He'd accused her of being self-righteous and a middle-class puritan and she had snapped back with a litany of his weaknesses: he was lazy and vain, passive and selfish, and he lacked any will-power' (5). For all of Aisha's self-righteousness, however, when she meets with her friends Anouk and Rosie for lunch she hypocritically lights a cigarette to calm her nerves. She later takes a second cigarette 'furtively, guiltily' from Anouk's pack, at which point Anouk observes pointedly to Rosie, foreshadowing Aisha's later infidelity: 'Has it struck you that smoking is the new adultery?' (79). Beginning with Hector and Aisha, then, Tsiolkas presents the reader with a series of characters who are caught in cycles of addiction and recovery that entangle even the most strong-willed among them.

What is new and innovative about *The Slap* is the insightful way that Tsiolkas connects discipline to the body, especially through the motif of sexuality. This line of thought resonates strongly with the work of the French theorist Michel Foucault, who similarly interprets the rise of modern disciplinary mechanisms, especially in the realm of sexuality, against the grain of his reader's expectations. While both authors are interested in the repressive effects of a puritanical approach to life and sexuality, they are equally critical of the way in which conventional attempts to overcome such a mindset can be ineffective and self-defeating. Foucault, in particular, warns his readers that guarding rigorously against puritanism can itself lead to

a kind of police mentality—'the fascism in us all, in our heads and in our everyday behaviour, the fascism that […] causes us to desire the very thing that dominates and exploits us,' he writes in the preface to *Anti-Oedipus* (1972) (xv). Such caveats have largely fallen on deaf ears, it seems, for Foucault's best-known concept continues to be the panopticon from *Discipline and Punish* (1975), a work that is often read simplistically as a call to arms to be 'vigilant' against the forces of repression that are inflicted on the modern individual.

Yet the addictions and flaws that mar the lives of the characters in Tsiolkas's novel can hardly be said to have been imposed from the outside. There is no external authority 'forcing' Hector to smoke, just as there is no one coercing Gary, Hugo's alcoholic father, to drink. While the easy assumption would be that these characters lack the required will-power to give up their addictions, such a conclusion stems from the problematic assumption that they possess an unqualified free will that allows them to throw off the chains of addiction simply by making a conscious choice to change. Tsiolkas, however, does not subscribe to such a simplistic view of human decision-making. All choices in the novel are shaped by a mixture of desire and circumstance, a symbiotic relationship in which one factor shapes and informs the other.

Tsiolkas underscores this idea, for instance, when he writes that the initial confrontation between Hugo and Harry's eight-year-old son Rocco occurs along familiar lines because 'they were all their fathers' sons' (Tsiolkas 34). At lunch with Anouk and Aisha, Rosie similarly observes that she and her friends are 'turning into our mothers' (68). People cannot choose their parents, and yet the palette of their personality—emotionally, culturally, genetically—is shaped by this basic relationship, a point that Tsiolkas reiterates throughout the novel by highlighting the impact of parents on their children. Thus, in the light of his domineering mother Koula, the reader can see that Hector's cigarette addiction is a compensatory means of gaining a measure of emotional control in his life, that Connie's acceptance of Richie's homosexuality arises out of her own unusual upbringing,

and that Hugo's overbearing narcissism is the combined product of Rosie's misguided indulgence and Gary's self-hatred.

This model of influence is replicated, in turn, at the broader, cultural level, so that Hector and Harry are shaped by their shared Greek heritage, Aisha by her Indian parents, and Bilal by his status as both an Indigenous man and a Muslim. These influences are social currents that affect the parameters of their particular personalities. It is not a rigidly deterministic worldview, but one that is grounded instead in an evolutionary notion of chance and probability. In Tsiolkas's vision it is certainly possible to take charge of one's life—Bilal, who successfully converted to Islam in order to reform his character, is an excellent example of such a transformation—but the self-discipline required to be capable of such a step in the first place is something that also derives from one's upbringing. The capacity for self-discipline, to take hold of one's own destiny, is a learned condition that, in a paradoxical twist, is only inscribed onto people by the circumstances that educate them into this mindset—that is, by social forces are largely out of their control. Even then, self-discipline does not guarantee success, for it can easily become another twist in the history of a bad habit; with the litany of relapsed drug addicts, backsliding smokers, incurable drunks, and serial adulterers scattered throughout the pages of *The Slap* providing telling examples of this self-defeating cycle of failed reform.

Foucault's insights into the function of disciplinary practices are particularly helpful in understanding the prevailing mood of Tsiolkas's novel. Throughout his work, Foucault expresses his concern that modernity has led to a series of social controls that are grounded in the combined discourses of science (including medicine and psychiatry) and the law. In *Discipline and Punish*, he looks at some notable examples of how prison inventions, have become commonplace instruments of discipline. The repressive effects of these new technologies have been well-documented, but the deeper interest of Foucault and Tsiolkas lies in how society *produces* the individuals that inhabit its communal space. In *The Slap*, the only

visible intervention of the state occurs when Harry is put on trial for slapping Hugo, a moment of external 'correction' that Tsiolkas presents as a farcical, almost inconsequential event. The real concern lies with the ways in which his characters have been conditioned to think and behave by the various factors that shape their personalities, from social class to cultural heritage to sexual mores. The self-inflicted miseries that permeate the lives of Tsiolkas's characters are largely the product of a mindset that, in the name of liberation, has short-circuited its own logic.

Tsiolkas's characters have an ingrained suspicion of anything that compromises their autonomy, but seem blind to the slavish way in which they respond to these threats. It is this subtle shift from the critical to the ideological that Tsiolkas highlights throughout the novel, examining how discourses that formerly held out the promise of freedom and equality have led, through a perversion of their own logic, to the opposite outcome. One example is Tsiolkas's representation of feminism in the novel, such as the scene where Anouk finds herself accosted by a trio of teenage girls who shove her to one side without a word of apology. Anouk laments the situation: '[A]s much as I hate to say it, I think we feminists have helped create it. These little bitches think they have the right to do anything they want but they don't care about the consequences' (68). Tsiolkas is not condemning feminism as such, but is pointing out instead how a mode of social critique can be hijacked, transforming the logic of female affirmation into a means for turning women against each other, in direct contradiction to its original goals. Such perversions of logic occur at the expense of legitimate analysis, with the teenagers that Anouk encounters, for instance, representing the end product of this ideological simulacrum of feminism. It is as though the propagation of critical messages, rather than providing society with the capacity for insight into its problems, has succeeded only in inoculating it from the process of genuine reform.

In *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction* (1976) Foucault, ever a sceptic about the possibility of uncomplicated liberation, puts

forward the more subtle thesis that discipline is an *ambivalent* tool that may be used for a range of outcomes and purposes. Perhaps the most startling of his observations occurs in Chapter 4, in which he attempts to trace a timeline for the development of modern sexuality. Dismissing as simplistic the popular view that sexuality underwent a phase of increasing repression beginning in the seventeenth century from which the relative sexual freedom of the twentieth century has slowly released us, Foucault instead points to the latter part of the eighteenth century as a crucial transitional period:

> It was during […] the end of the eighteenth century … that there emerged a completely new technology of sex; new in that for the most part it escaped the ecclesiastical institution without being truly independent of the thematic of sin. Through pedagogy, medicine, and economics, it made sex not only a secular concern but a concern of the state as well; to be more exact, sex became a matter that required the social body as a whole, and virtually all of its individuals, to place themselves under surveillance. (116)

Writing at the end of a century that had spent the bulk of its fury on condemning the banality, greed, and puritanical hysteria of the bourgeoisie, Foucault unexpectedly seeks to overturn the conventional view of this class's ambitions. For that narrative to fit, Foucault argues, the new disciplinary technologies ought to have been aimed primarily at the lower classes in an attempt to place them under the watchful eye of the state. Instead, it was the exact opposite that occurred:

> If one writes the history of sexuality in terms of repression, relating this repression to the utilization of labour capacity, one must suppose that sexual controls were the more intense and meticulous as they were directed at the poorer classes; one has to assume they followed the path of greatest domination and the most systematic exploitation: the young adult man […] had to be

> the primary target of a subjugation destined to shift the energy available for useless pleasure toward compulsory labour. But this does not appear to be the way things actually happened. On the contrary, the most rigorous techniques were formed and, more particularly, applied first, with the greatest intensity, in the economically privileged and politically dominant classes. (120)

At first, such a move appears to make little sense—why would the ruling classes apply repressive techniques to themselves first? Wouldn't it make more sense for them to use these mechanisms to control the working classes instead? The answer, explains Foucault, lies in the ambiguous nature of discipline, which is not only repressive, but may also be used as a positive tool to attain other goals, a function that is all too often overlooked and ignored.

Foucault dismisses as absurd the notion that the ruling classes are 'repressing' themselves. Rather, the bourgeois class embraced self-discipline as a mode of self-empowerment, stifling their desires in order to gain in control and efficiency. It is thus the 'idle' woman of the household, Foucault points out, who becomes the first target of sexual discipline, leading to a 'hysterisation of woman' that could be used to justify a constant process of monitoring and surveillance for the sake of protecting her 'health' (that is, her sexual virtue) (121). A parallel concern surrounds the adolescent children of the upper classes, 'not the child of the people, the future worker who had to be taught the disciplines of the body, but rather the schoolboy […] who was in danger of compromising not so much his physical strength as his intellectual capacity, his moral fiber' (121). While the initial implementation of these strategies might at first glance seem repressive, Foucault argues, their actual goal appears to be to inculcate a kind of 'inner' virtue in their subjects that transforms them into self-empowered, disciplined individuals.

> It seems in fact that what was involved was not asceticism […] but on the contrary an intensification of the body, a problematization

> of health and its operational terms: it was a question of techniques for maximizing life. The primary concern was not repression of the sex of the classes to be exploited, but rather the body, vigor, longevity, progeniture, and descent of the classes that 'ruled.' This was the purpose for which the deployment of sexuality was first established, as a new distribution of pleasures, discourses, truth, and powers; it has to be seen as the self-affirmation of one class rather than the enslavement of another[.] (122–3)

It was not until well into the nineteenth century that this bourgeois phenomenon of the deployment of sexuality began to be applied to the lower classes. Despite the extension of these ideas and practices into the general population, 'sexuality is originally, historically bourgeois, and […] it induces specific class effects' (127). The key insight that Foucault provides is that this quest for control is not primarily about sexuality—it is about an affirmation of the self, a will to power that, through self-discipline, seeks to stake its own political claim on society.

It is the widespread failure of Australian society to cultivate the virtue of self-discipline that has led to the self-defeating behaviours on display in the novel. When Aisha points out that 'Hugo is only a child. He doesn't know better,' for instance, Hector replies: 'Exactly the damned problem. He doesn't know better because he has not been taught to know better' (Tsiolkas 338). Hugo has not been socialised into the standards of behaviour expected by the rest of society, leaving him to flounder in the self-indulgent waters of his own narcissism. Thus, 'the supposed enlightened and child-focused philosophies that underpinned Rosie's approach to motherhood' (392) are undermined by the fact that Hugo is deprived, by his parents' indulgence, of the internal capacity for self-control that will allow him to succeed later in life. When the protective veil of his parents withdraws, Hector points out, Hugo will likely experience a reality check that will damage rather than correct him. Robbed of a sense of virtue by his parents, Hugo stands as a testament to a society in which liberalism, in the name of freedom and personal choice, defeats its own stated goals.

The way in which this problem of self-discipline cuts across disparate communities shows that the issues in *The Slap* go beyond the particularities of any one culture and reflect instead the broader complications of modernity. That is why Tsiolkas's novel connects so strongly with Foucault's work, even though the latter's historical focus is largely drawn from French culture. In the same way that Foucault traces the way in which the modern tools of prison culture (timetables, examinations, surveillance) can cross over cultural lines and contexts, so too the shift in class values outlined in *The History of Sexuality* also resounds, at different local speeds and variations, across the modern world. Because Australia is a relatively young society, it lacks the deeply entrenched hierarchies and traditions that mark the old world societies of Europe and Asia. To 'be an Aussie,' as Manolis envisions it in *The Slap*, is to lack any formal ties to the past, to inhabit a living space that, from the perspective of his upbringing, makes it equivalent to being 'cultureless' (347). The apparent freedom that such an escape from the old ties offers presents a different kind of problem: with no standard of behaviour, how can Australians possibly formulate their own set of values? The flaw that Hector identifies in Hugo's character—that he 'doesn't know better because he has not been taught to know better' (338)—echoes the broader condition of Australian culture.

But the key battleground for Tsiolkas, as with Foucault before him, lies with the body and its relationship to desire, especially sexual desire. Tsiolkas, as we observed earlier, presents a challenge to the notion of an unfettered free will by examining the influential role played such factors as class, education, ethnicity, gender, and family. Sexuality is important, Foucault explains in 'A Preface to Transgression' (1963), because it makes us acutely aware of the liminal space of our existence, where it becomes impossible to determine the difference between inside and outside:

> We have not in the least liberated sexuality, though we have, to be exact, carried it to its limits: the limit of consciousness, because it

> ultimately dictates the only possible reading of our unconscious; the limit of the law, since it seems the sole substance of universal taboos; the limit of language, since it traces that line of foam showing just how far speech may advance upon the sands of silence. (30)

Not only are the objects of human desire external to our existence, but so too are the social forces that have shaped us to want those things in the first place. As Foucault points out in this passage, it is the unsettling origins of our sense of intimacy that, in desire, can make us feel alienated and distant from our own selves.

For Tsiolkas this question of agency has enormous practical and ethical consequences. When desire seizes us, it does so without our consent. Desire is thus never a straightforward matter of choice, and so it is crucial, from an ethical perspective, that people are capable of distinguishing whether a desire accords with or violates their sense of themselves. At the most prosaic level, the reader can see this dynamic in the slap that is inflicted on Hugo, especially when viewed through the ambivalent eyes of Aisha. Even though Aisha maintains outwardly that Harry should not have hit Hugo, the reader suspects that she is not entirely sincere in this matter—as it turns out, she secretly harbours resentment against Harry for beating his wife, and she allows this feeling to trump her deeper belief that Hugo needs to be disciplined, a sentiment she lets slip in a later conversation with Connie. The slap thus functions in the novel as a metaphor of how desire seizes hold of its object without asking any kind of permission. What ultimately matters is how the slap is received: whether it is rejected as a brutal act of injustice (as in Hugo's dubious case) or whether it is accepted as the expression of just indignation (such as when Aisha later slaps Richie). The perceived justice of the slap thus stems from whether or not its recipient internalises the implicit behavioural critique that accompanies the physical blow.

Tsiolkas pushes this issue further by examining the question of agency at its most controversial points. Tsiolkas frequently has his

characters take drugs, for instance, as a way of experimenting with their intentionality, probing to what extent chemicals (external) influence his characters' moods (internal) in ways that cause them to step out of their normal mindset: it is under the influence of amphetamines, for instance, that Aisha summons the courage to commit adultery with Art Xing; Harry is shown taking cocaine in the lead-up to his sexual encounters; and Connie shares what 'was close to a lesbo moment' with Jenna while on ecstasy, shortly before she proceeds half-heartedly to have sex with Ali (Tsiolkas 198). Even without the involvement of mood-altering chemicals, there are sexual moments in the novel that walk a thin line between rape and passion, perhaps none more so than this ambiguous encounter between Harry and his wife Sandi:

> 'Fuck my mouth,' she urged and took his cock once more inside her. He closed his eyes again and this time he thrust his body into her mouth. 'This it, honey, that's beautiful.' Silently, not wishing to offend her, he mouthed words to Kelly. Suck me, bitch. Come on, bitch, suck me off. […] He could see her gagging but when he stopped his thrusting she clutched his arse and pushing him deep into her. He blew his cheeks out, stifled his shout and came with savage force. Sandi refused to release him. (112–13)

Although this scene represents consensual sex between married partners, Tsiolkas subverts its intimacy by revealing to the reader that the true source of Harry's excitement comes from silently pretending that this is an act of violation and, rather than focusing on Sandi, imagining that he is being pleasured by his mistress, Kelly. The relationship between these two characters is clearly abusive, but Sandi supports Harry implicitly, imposing an internal justification in her own mind for his actions.

These examples reinforce the novel's mounting evidence that there is a widespread resistance in Australian culture to even the healthiest forms of corrective. The lack of self-discipline displayed

by its characters has infected their basic capacity for critique, often leaving them struggling violently against the very medicine they need in order to overcome their problems. Hugo is the prime example, with the slap he wails about so loudly paling in comparison with the other questionable things he encounters in the novel, such as his parents' constant fighting and his exposure to pornography. The refusal to accept criticism breeds a reactive form of aggression, the seeds of which have clearly been planted in Hugo when he proclaims: 'No one is allowed to touch my body without my permission' (43). Hector provides a silent response: 'How about when he kicks someone or hits out at another kid? Who gives him permission to do that?' (43). Hugo's words show that he is learning to justify his own bad actions, a rhetorical trick that will allow him to fend off genuine attempts to correct his conduct. The worst example of this kind of behaviour in the novel, though, is when Connie tells Richie that Hector raped her. Motivated by pain and confusion over Hector's decision to end their affair, Connie's lie allows her to create a fantasy in which she is in charge of events. Tsiolkas reveals the full extent of Connie's duplicity as the narrative unfolds, for not only does she later seem unruffled by the dubious consensuality of her sexual encounter with Ali, but she also allows a traumatised Richie to be an unwitting scapegoat when he tells Connie's story to Aisha—an incident that ends, in a gesture of poetic irony, with Aisha, a loud critic of Harry's original strike against Hugo, slapping Richie. In the cases of both Connie and Hugo, Tsiolkas is not downplaying the horror or injustice of either rape or physical assault. Instead, he is pointing the way in which the selfishness and lack of discipline of these two characters are a form of crying 'wolf,' drawing attention to their purely imagined mistreatment in a way that distracts from the prevention of actual abuses.

The most successful characters in *The Slap*, from the point of view of self-discipline, are Bilal and his wife Shamira, who together have 'shed their pasts and grown new, vastly different skins' (71). Tsiolkas provides these two characters with lowly starting points in the social order: Bilal, known as Terry before his conversion, is an Indigenous

man who struggled with alcoholism and violence throughout his youth, while Shamira, who has also escaped from a family beset by similar problems, humbly tells Gary and Rosie that she is 'really just a white-trash scrubber underneath all this' (272). The novel charts their steady rise, from the couple's newfound happiness in the discipline of their religion to the upward mobility that allows them to buy a new 'house in Thomastown' (289). The social reversal is completed when Bilal severs his family's connection to Gary and Rosie after recognising the lack of virtue in his former friends. 'You've got bad blood,' Bilal tells Gary. 'We've escaped your lot, me and my Sammi' (287). The key to Bilal and Shamira's success comes from the way they break with the empty illusion of control employed by many of the other characters. Instead, Bilal and Shamira submit their 'inner' beings to the external force of their religion—the word 'Muslim,' after all, means 'one who submits (to God).' What matters is not the particular form of their compliance (it is unlikely that Tsiolkas is trying to convince his readers to convert to Islam) but the larger truth their example reveals: if we want to gain power and self-knowledge, it is necessary at times to humble ourselves, to admit that there is wisdom and knowledge that is greater than our own, and to submit ourselves to learning its ways.

Tsiolkas thus pinpoints a crucial paradox of modernity in the course of *The Slap*, wherein this policy of strategic submission, as Foucault highlights in *The History of Sexuality*, remains the domain of the privileged classes, an idea Tsiolkas hints at in the novel's occasional ruminations on the value of a private-school education. The larger population, by contrast, is fed a message of false autonomy, told that they are in charge of their lives even though they are often lacking the necessary foundation of learning and self-discipline that makes freedom possible. Therein lies the familiar sense of ambivalence at the heart of modernity. For while the virtue that proceeds from self-discipline makes possible a meritocratic egalitarianism that could not exist before the bourgeois age, as the example of Bilal and Shamira demonstrates, these two characters are,

in truth, the exception that proves the rule. Tsiolkas shows in *The Slap* that the democratic ideal of Australian society continues to split and crack along the all-too-familiar lines of class, so that those who need the virtue of self-discipline the most are the ones least likely to be exposed to its rigours.

**Works Cited**

Foucault, Michel. 'A Preface to Transgression.' *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. Trans. Donald F. Bouchard. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.

——. Preface. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. By Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. London: Continuum, 2004. xiii–xvi.

——. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979.

——. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. Trans. Robert Hurley. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978.

Mukherjee, Neel. Review of *The Slap*, by Christos Tsiolkas. *The Telegraph*. 6 June 2010. Web. 19 Feb. 2012.

Tsiolkas, Christos. *The Slap*. London: Penguin, 2010.